

REMARKS

INTRODUCTION:

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1-12, 16, 17, 19, 22, 23, 25, and 26 have been amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 1-12, 16, 17, 19, 22, 23, 25, and 26 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is respectfully requested.

OBJECTION TO THE TITLE:

In the Office Action, at page 2, numbered paragraph 3, the title was objected to as not being descriptive. In view of the proposed amended title set forth above, the outstanding objection to the title should be resolved.

CLAIM OBJECTIONS:

The Office Action, at page 3, numbered paragraph 4, objected to claims 1, 16, 22 and 25 for various informalities. The claims have been amended in response thereto and withdrawal of the objection is requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned if further amendments are deemed necessary to correct the informalities identified in the Office Action.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102:

Starting on page 3, numbered paragraph 5, claims 11, 12, 17, 20, 23, and 26 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by PGPUB NO 2005/0259319 to Honda et al. (hereinafter "Honda").

As discussed during the Examiner Interview, conducted on January 22, 2008, Honda is directed to a speech processing system that translates spoken word from one language to another (Abstract). The words spoken by the user in Honda are not used to assist a translation system, the words spoken by the user in Honda are the words to be translated. Hence, Honda

is not directed to a previously translated document, but rather performs the translation without the assistance of a user.

In contrast, claims 11, 17, 20, 23, and 26 each recites "translating an inputted original sentence... from a document" (e.g., claim 1, line 2) and "re-translating the whole original sentence in order to correct the translated sentence" (e.g., claim 1, lines 6-7). Since Honda does not translate words from a document, but rather translates spoken word from one language to another, it is submitted that claims 11, 17, 20, 23, and 26, as well as claim 12 that depends from claim 11, are patentably distinguishable over Honda.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103:

Starting on page 5, numbered paragraph 8, claims 1-10, 16, 19, 22, and 25 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No 6,06,520 to Lee and in view of Honda.

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 1, 16, 19, 22, and 25 each recites "translating an inputted original sentence into a translated sentence by selecting each translated word from previously translated documents" (e.g., claim 1, lines 2-3). As stated above, and during the Examiner Interview, both Honda and Lee translate spoken word and not documents. In addition, claims 1, 16, 19, 22, and 25 each recites "correcting the translated sentence ... by using the selected another translated word outputted from the speech recognition" (e.g., claim 1, last two lines). Since the output of the speech recognition in both Honda and Lee does not "correct... a translated sentence" as recited above, claims 1, 16, 19, 22, and 25 further distinguish over Honda and Lee.

Therefore, it is submitted that claims 1, 16, 19, 22, and 25, as well as claims 2-10 that depend on claim 1, are patentably distinguishable over Honda and Lee, alone or in combination.

CONCLUSION:

In accordance with the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that all outstanding objections and rejections have been overcome and/or rendered moot. And further, that all pending claims patentably distinguish over the prior art. Thus, there being no further

outstanding objections or rejections, the application is submitted as being in condition for allowance which action is earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner has any remaining issues to be addressed, it is believed that prosecution can be expedited by the Examiner contacting the undersigned attorney for a telephone interview to discuss resolution of such issues.

If there are any underpayments or overpayments of fees associated with the filing of this Amendment, please charge and/or credit the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: February 1, 2008

By: David E. Moore
David E. Moore
Registration No. 59,047

1201 New York Avenue, N.W.
Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501